

Montgomery County Water Quality Advisory Group
Meeting Minutes for June 8, 2015

Member and affiliation	Present		Others in attendance and affiliation
	Yes	No	
Keith Brooks, public-at-large		X	Bob Buglass -- WSSC
Mary Campbell, public-at-large	X		
Dan Dozier, co-chair, public-at-large	X		
Korkud Egrican, public-at-large	X		
Nate Engle, academic/scientific		X	
Beth Forbes, public-at-large	X		
Andy Garfinkel, business		X	
Philip Kibak, public-at-large	X		
Paul Hlavinka, co-chair, public-at-large	X		
Christopher Meaney, academic/scientific	X		
Annette Rosenblum, academic/scientific	X		
Scott Roser, business	X		
Linda Silversmith, public-at-large	X		
Phil Wagner, business	X		
Paul Billingsley, WSSC	X		
Pam Parker, DEP	X		
Mark Symborski, MNCPPC	X		
	Major Points		
7:03 PM Convening of Meeting	As co-chair, Paul convened the meeting.		
7:04 PM Committee Business	The May minutes were approved with three minor corrections, and one update was added to the June agenda (Mark regarding master plans). Then everyone applauded as Beth Forbes received a certificate recognizing her service as both long-time member and recent co-chair.		
7:09 PM Bob Buglass on Pesticide Testing of Drinking Water	<p>Paul introduced Bob Buglass of WSSC. [His contact information is as follows: Bob Buglass, Environmental Sciences Unit Coordinator, WSSC Technical Services Group, Bob.Buglass@wsscwater.com.] Copies of Bob's slides are available at http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/DEP/Resources/Files/downloads/water/advisory-group/pesticide-monitoring-wssc.pdf. WSSC regularly monitors for ~53 pesticides in tap and source waters (monthly or quarterly w/ most not at detectable levels), reports annually via Tap Water Analysis Reports posted on its website, and measures some other pesticides for special monitoring studies and for the Unregulated Contaminants Monitoring Rule.</p> <p>A 2002 USGS/NASA study found some herbicides at trace amounts (ppb levels) in MD source waters w/ no health standards violated. Regulations require that any exceeding of maximum contaminant levels be announced. In a 2008 MWWCOG study of 19 cpds, only one of four pesticides was detected (atrazine). COG monitoring continues for atrazine, lindane, and methoxychlor. In three rounds of Safe Clean Water Act monitoring, most pesticides were undetectable, except that chlorate appear at a detectable but low level. In 2014-15 tap water studies, five pesticides</p>		

Montgomery County Water Quality Advisory Group
Meeting Minutes for June 8, 2015

ACTION ITEM	<p>were detectable at low levels, with none exceeding EPA limits. Probably agriculture was their source.</p> <p>Members asked about taste tests (which the Patuxent plant will do this year) and whether the County Council has this WSSC information on pesticides (probably not) as background for the bill it is considering. Products of chlorination are not removed; they might stick to soil particles; tracing them is a difficult analytical problem. For other Q&A see the appendix.</p> <p>After also hearing Korkud Egrican's talk (see below), WQAG members decided to write a letter for the June 15 meeting of the T&E Committee, to be shared as well with the rest of the County Council and the County Executive, indicating what we have learned about pesticides in county waters. ***Mary Campbell will write and circulate a draft.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">7:40 PM</p> <p>Emerging Contaminants in Drinking Water Sources</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Korkud Egrican</p>	<p>Korkud Egrican spoke on Emerging Contaminants in Drinking Water Sources, indicating that his main focus is the sources and the pathways and effects of endocrine disruptors affecting human or animal endocrine systems. Some endocrine disruptors are natural, and some are man-made. His slides are available at https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/DEP/Resources/Files/downloads/water/advisory-group/edcs-wqag-060815.pdf.</p> <p>The effects can be at multiple levels, such as organism and ecosystem. One example is a fish (downstream from a source) with dual gender characteristics. Detection assays can now measure 1 part per trillion (ppt). None of the major compounds being looked at has been found in WSSC waters. EPA currently leaves responsibility to local agencies. No one approach works to removal all chemicals of concern, leading to cost issues and weighing costs vs. benefits.</p> <p>During Q&A, Korkud indicated that human health effects are currently seen as negligible. He does not know if any endocrine disrupters accumulate up a food chain. It could be wise not to flush pharmaceuticals down toilets. Nicotine and caffeine show up a lot.</p> <p>Pam pointed out that the county does not look at drinking water and that much of the county's liquid waste goes to the Blue Plains facility.</p> <p>Chris recommended the following reference for its early attention to endocrine disruptors: Our Stolen Future: Are We Threatening Our Fertility, Intelligence, and Survival?--A Scientific Detective Story Paperback – March 1, 1997, by Theo Colborn et al.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">8:05 PM</p> <p>Updates & Announcements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chris Meaney has not yet had a chance to draft the planned e-mail to the Solid Waste Advisory Committee about common interests. • Mark Symborski reviewed his recent e-mail to other WQAG members addressing the Bethesda sector plan and asking if the group wants to send a letter to the Planning Board with any comments before a June 24 hearing. The white paper planned by a recent M-NCPPC staff presenter has not been done due to family illness.

Montgomery County Water Quality Advisory Group
Meeting Minutes for June 8, 2015

<p style="text-align: center;">ACTION ITEM</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pam Parker raised a procedural question about whether WQAG is allowed to advise the planning board or only the County Council and County Executive. Mark then proposed encouraging individual comments instead. • Other members wondered if WQAG could do a letter to the planning board if also sending copies to the CC and CE. The major themes of such a letter could be that sector plans should take into account the anticipated environmental impacts of development and should allow for incentives for private owners to use environmental tools. In addition, county roads should be better designed for stormwater management. ***Dan Dozier will draft a letter for further WQAG discussion. • Given the county's limited greenfields for new development, Mark emphasized that improving water quality ought to be one facet of the redevelopment process. Dan indicated that he and others in the Little Falls Watershed Alliance want the Little Falls sector plan to look at the impact of development on Willett Branch Creek. • The Dept. of Env. Protection has a plan to restore creeks that needs to be coordinated with the planning of M-NPPC. Perhaps the sector plans are a mechanism for such coordination. Suggestion for a WQAG speaker: individual in charge of creek restoration. Scott indicated that one issue is that the county wants 100% of storm water management to occur onsite; but sometimes there are waivers. • Meo Curtis has left DEP. Pam is her replacement for now.
<p style="text-align: center;">8:55 PM</p> <p>Confirm Next Meeting and Future Meetings</p>	<p>Filling WQAG vacancies: The county is (finally) getting ready to advertise advisory committee vacancies; Pam will circulate the wording to WQAG members, who can suggest changes.</p> <p>Upcoming Meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • July 13, Minutes: Philip Wagner; topic TBD • No August meeting • Tuesday, September 15 (as September 14 is a religious holiday), several topics under consideration; minutes, Beth Forbes <p>Additional Proposed Topics for Future Meetings (+see June 2015 list)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEP on water plans – Pam will check on this and see if Tom or Craig Carson is available for July on stream restoration priorities and integration with master plans. • Biological Condition Gradient – Pam will ask whether a newly hired individual, Jenny St. John who replaced retiree Keith Van Ness can be ready by September. • If Paul can identify a speaker, community gardening could be the July topic. Scott needs more time before talking about carbon sequestration. • Pam or Jenny could talk about Special Protection Areas.

Montgomery County Water Quality Advisory Group
Meeting Minutes for June 8, 2015

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• By September it might be possible to do an update on MS-4 permit reports re watershed management. Pam is working on a supplement to watershed reports for mid-July that might a September topic too.• Two years ago legislation was passed regarding a monitoring fund and new implementation regulations for Special Protection Areas (SPAs)– an update on this might be a September topic.
9:02 PM Meeting Adjourned	

APPENDIX I

ADDENDUM: June 2015 WQAG minutes – Post-meeting Q&A with Bob Buglass of WSSC

- I. During our June 8 discussions after Bob’s talk addressing what pesticides WSSC measures in source and tap water, the following questions came up. These were sent to Bob, who then provided the answers that follow each question. [His contact information is provided below and in the meeting minutes and on his first slide.]

1. Whether WSSC should regularly report MCLGs - and if so, should these be reported on the UCMR3 website

I looked at the 2014 Water Quality Report (link below) and it does show the MCLGs for those contaminants detected. Note – there was some discussion at the meeting that the MCLG (EPA’s non-enforceable Maximum Contaminant Level goal) for atrazine was lower than the MCL (the enforceable Maximum Contaminant Level), and lower than observed levels. This is not correct; the atrazine MCL and MCLG are both 3 micrograms per liter, and observed tap water levels are below both the MCL and MCLG. As discussed, atrazine, dalapon, and simazine are generally observed only during the growing season (May – September).

2. Do tap water reports identify source water data?

Unfortunately the Water Quality Reports only show tap water data, per EPA guidelines.

3. Please provide the web address on the new WSSC website for linking to the data you presented or referred to

<https://www.wsscwater.com/waterquality> is the link to the Water Quality Report page (from the WSSC home page, click on “Water Quality and Stewardship” and “Water Quality” on the drop-down menu).

<https://www.wsscwater.com/ucmr3> is the link to Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring data. As discussed, we detected 5 of the 28 listed contaminants, all inorganic chemicals (strontium, vanadium, total chromium, hexavalent chromium, and chlorate), all below known health reference levels.

- II. An additional question for Bob from a WQAG member at a later date: additional question for WSSC is whether all of the regulated pesticides/herbicides on this list are currently in use or if some of these are legacy pesticides (i.e. banned or no longer in use).

I am not sure. I suspect some may not be used anymore. I found a 2011 Maryland Dept of Agriculture report on pesticide use in Maryland (link below), which tabulates 361 pesticides known to be used in Maryland, down to those with 1 pound of active ingredient used. I searched on the first three in our list of monitored pesticides

Montgomery County Water Quality Advisory Group
Meeting Minutes for June 8, 2015

(1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene, 1,2,3-Trichloropropane, 1,2-Dibromoethane (EDB)) and did not get matches with MDA list, so at least some are not known to be used in Maryland, at least by the Dept of Agriculture. Among the top ten used per the MDA report, we monitor for glyphosate, 2,4-D, atrazine, and simazine, and for s-Metolachlor if Metolachlor is the same or includes s-Metolachlor. We indirectly monitor for chromic acid, arsenic pentoxide, and copper oxide by monitoring for chromium, arsenic, and copper (levels all well below SDWA MCLs).

Maryland Pesticide Usage Estimates

Rank	Pesticide Common Name	Pounds Active Ingredient
1	Chromic acid	5,145,298
2	Arsenic Pentoxide	3,718,525
3	Copper(II) oxide	2,358,000
4	Glyphosate	721,154
5	s-Metolachlor	555,807
6	2,4-D	439,538
7	Atrazine	381,321
8	Dimethoate	243,677
9	Imidacloprid	231,323
10	Simazine	200,734

http://www.mda.maryland.gov/documents/MD_Pesticide_Stats_2011.pdf

Bob Buglass, Environmental Sciences Unit Coordinator, WSSC Technical Services Group,
Bob.Buglass@wsscwater.com

APPENDIX B

Prior topics from the May minutes still under discussion for future meetings:

Proposed Topics for Future Meetings

- MS4 permit update (when appropriate sometime in 2015/2016)
- Expert panel on water quality benefits on stream restorations and report on County plans (Tom Schueler and/or Pam Parker)
- WSSC work under the consent decree in environmentally sensitive areas
- Carbon sequestration (Scott)
- Community gardening (Paul H.)
- E&S plan transparency (Dan, hold for now)
- New Smart Growth stormwater laws allowing nutrient trading – spring public review period
- Fracking (Mark)
- Special Protection Areas
- Biological Condition Gradient (Mark, TBD)
- Mont. Co. Sustainability Committee report and water related issues (TBD)
- WSSC discharges from Potomac Filtration Plant and the ensuing litigation (TBD)
- Limitations on advisory letters (BAC Coordinator)
- Water Quality Protection Charge Credits and Exemption, Bill 2-15